

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12 and 14-26. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 12, 14-17, 20 and 23-26 are amended herein, and new claim 27 is added. Claims 2 and 13 remain cancelled. Proper support for the amendments can be found at least at pages in FIGS. 8A and 8B including corresponding texts thereof. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1, 3-12 and 14-27 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: U.S. Patent No. 6,047,260 (Levinson), U.S. Patent No. 5,519,606 (Frid) and Windows 95™ Manual (Marks).

Levinson classifies tasks into a fixed task having a fixed start/stop time affording no marginal time and a floating task having a duration that is less than the time period between the earliest start time and the latest stop time with no fixed start/stop time, where the fixed and floating tasks have priorities and rewards associated therewith (see, col. 6, lines 36-50). Then, when an overlap occurs between a floating task and an unexpected event, the start/stop time of the floating tasks are adjusted (see, col. 10, lines 34-39). For example, the floating task initially scheduled between 9:00am and 4:00pm can be rescheduled for 3:00pm (see, col. 10, lines 22-31).

The Examiner acknowledges that Levinson does not disclose that overlapped term type schedules are maintained, but relies on Frid as disclosing the same. However, Frid is directed to displaying a schedule overlap in an overlapping form where a user selects whether to adjust the overlap or leave the same overlapped. For example, as shown in FIG. 3E, the system creates a duplicate 10:00 a.m. field for two events scheduled at 10:00 a.m., the user is then requested to reconcile the events which not only overlap in duration but also conflict as to start time (see, also col. 5, lines 52-64).

The Examiner also admits that Levinson does not disclose storing a history of deleted schedules upon deleting or adjusting schedules and referring to the same for recovery, but relies on Marks as teaching the same. Marks is directed to limited to a folder in Windows™ that does not actually remove files therein until the user opens the folder, selects the files and deletes the files (see, page 1, paragraph 4).

The present invention addresses schedule overlaps in accordance with types of the schedules overlapped, for example, an overlap between schedules classified as a term type, a term type and a period type and a period type and the period type. In accordance with the type of schedules overlapped, corresponding adjustments are applied to address the overlap. For example, as shown in FIGS. 8A and 8B, different forms of adjustments are applied based on a type of a new schedule and a type of an existing schedule with which the new schedule overlaps (see also, corresponding text of FIGS. 8A and 8B).

Independent claim 1, by example, recites that an inputted schedule is classified into “any type of a term type schedule in which designated date/time is set to a term of an operation or a period type schedule in which a designated certain period is assured for the operation on the basis of information of said inputted schedule.” The schedules are then adjusted “under different conditions in accordance with a combination of the schedule types” when the inputted schedule overlaps with an existing schedule with respect to the time where “overlapped term type schedules” are maintained.

Similarly, independent claims 12 and 23 also recite, adjusting the schedules “under different conditions” in accordance with a combination of the schedule types, and independent claim 24 recites, “adjusting scheduling overlaps according to said classifying” of newly input schedule and existing schedules.

Independent claims 25 and 26 recite, “adjusting existing schedules according to said classifying of the types where each of the overlapped schedules are classified into the types and overlapped schedules having a predetermined type are maintained” and “adjusting the overlapped schedules according to the grouping when each of the overlapped schedules are not classified into the first type”, respectively.

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest adjusting overlapped schedules based on combination types of the schedules where the overlapped schedules are adjusted “under different conditions” and “according to “said classifying” of the overlapped schedules (see, independent claims).

Dependent claims 11 and 22 recite, “a recovery of the schedule deleted due to the schedule adjustment or a return of the schedule to an initial position moved due to the schedule adjustment” based on classification of schedule types (see also, independent claims from which claims 11 and 22 depend).

The combination of Levinson and Marks does not teach or suggest adjusting overlaps based on classification of schedules overlapped including performing "a recovery of the schedule deleted due to the schedule adjustment or a return of the schedule to an initial position moved due to the schedule adjustment", as recited in dependent claims 11 and 22.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claims 5 and 16, "in the case where the inputted new schedule and the existing schedule are the term type schedules and terms of both of said schedules overlap, said schedule adjusting unit assembles the new schedule as it is without adjusting both of said schedules" (emphasis added). The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claims 5 and 16.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 27 has been added to recite, "determining types of each schedule resulting in an overlap in accordance with classification of each of the schedules." As such, the present invention includes, "selectively adjusting the overlap in accordance with the classification of each of the schedules", where overlapped schedules classified as having "a term of operation with identical designated date/time are maintained overlapped."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, "determining types of each schedule resulting in an overlap", "selectively adjusting the overlap" where overlapped schedules classified as having "a term of operation with identical designated date/time are maintained overlapped", as recited in new claim 27.

Therefore, it is submitted that new claim 27 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.


Serial No. 09/764,301

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 03/10/2006

By: 
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501